

RIVERS MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Meeting Minutes
September 29, 2005
NHDES, Concord, NH
Rooms 112/113
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm**

Members Present

Bob Beaurivage
Ben Frost
Deborah Hinman
Bill Ingham
Ken Kimball, Chair
Johanna Lyons
Jamie Robertson
Wesley Stinson
Michele L. Tremblay, Vice Chair
Vacant

Representing

Public Water Suppliers
Office of Energy and Planning
NH Assn. Conservation Commissions
Fish & Game Department
Recreational Interests
Dept. Resources & Economic Development
Agricultural Interests
Historical & Archaeological Interests
Conservation Interests
NH Fish & Game Commission

Term

Sept. 28, 2007 V
Indefinite NV
Oct. 12, 2007 V
Indefinite NV
Dec. 28, 2005 V
Indefinite NV
March 22, 2006 V
June 15, 2007 V
Dec. 28, 2005 V
Sept. 28, 2006

Members Absent

George Lagassa
Gail McWilliam
Allan Palmer
Ted Sutton

Granite State Hydropower
Department of Agriculture
Business and Industry Association
Municipal Government

Jan. 5, 2006 V
Indefinite NV
Sept. 28, 2007 V
Nov. 16, 2005 V

Guests Present

Walter Morse
Carl Paulsen
Danielle Fillis
Tom Quarles
Mark Hemmerlein
Ken Toppin
Brian Mrazik
Mike Norris

Fish & Game Commission
NH Rivers Council
Nashua Regional Planning Commission
Public Water Access Advisory Board
NH DOT
USGS
USGS
USGS

DES Staff Present

Jacquie Colburn
Paul Currier
Wayne Ives
Marie LosKamp
Rich Chormann
Steve Doyon
Ted Walsh

Lakes Coordinator, Watershed Mgmt. Bureau
Administrator, Watershed Mgmt. Bureau
Instream Flow Coordinator, Watershed Mgmt. Bureau
Exec. Secretary, Watershed Mgmt. Bureau
Administrator, Geological Survey
Administrator, Water Resources Section, Dam Bureau
VRAP Coordinator, Watershed Mgmt. Bureau

I. 1:00-1:15 pm: Introductions and Acceptance of April 1, 2005 Minutes (Vote Required)

RMAC Chair, Ken Kimball, opened the meeting at 1:05 p.m. Introductions were made.

- **A motion was made by Michele L. Tremblay to accept the April 1, 2005 meeting minutes, seconded by Wesley Stinson and the vote was unanimous to accept the minutes of April 1, 2005 with the change requested by Carl Paulsen to change one sentence to read, "There was dissent from another member" and to delete the remainder of the sentence.**
- ***Ken Kimball requested that Item III of the Agenda be moved to Item II due to USGS staff present for discussions.***

II. 1:30-2:15 pm: Status of USGS Gages in NH – Paul Currier/USGS staff

- **Ken Kimball** opened the discussion by stating that over the last couple of years the USGS gaging stations that received funding every year, have had budget cuts both at the federal level and the state level. Since funding has decreased, the number of stream gages that existed across the state has diminished. This is a problem that not only NH is facing but it is a national problem as well. The RMAC requested that Paul and his staff put together strawman documents. The first one is a recommendation to the commissioner to convene a task force in NH, and the second is a strategy for NH. There are roles for both the RMAC and LACs.
- **Paul Currier** - deferred to Wayne Ives and Steve Doyon to explain what has happened in the last two years.
- **Wayne Ives** - USGS operates 48 gages in New Hampshire, 3 monitor levels only and do not measure flow volumes. As of 9/30/04, 7 gages were dropped from their program and 5 additional gages were taken over by DES. This year two more gages were discontinued and taken over by DES.
- **Steve Doyon** stated that all five gages taken over by DES are dam related and required for their operations. Information is available on our web site for the 10 gages used by the Dam Bureau.
- **Wayne** –We have lost 14 gages in the 18 months. We need to determine what we need for data and then how to get it. We have tested volunteers to operate gages.
- **Brian Mrazik (USGS)** – Passed around handouts with statistics and stated that on a national level the program has been level funded. In NH in the upcoming year he sees NH walking away from funds that were available, and doesn't see funding at the federal level. They are in the process of diverting matching funds to use in other states and projects. All other customers are seeing an increase in the gaging network, whereas in NH numbers are plummeting. Brian encouraged the committee to go to the state to put more money toward gages. Pull together a network to meet the long term interests of the state and long term interests of flood warning. Before gages are abandoned by USGS convince the legislators that USGS has a long term commitment.
- **Mike Norris (USGS)** – I would like to go through numerous comments on the strategy. Nationally, I am responsible for gages, am an expert on stream gaging and I have a lot to offer to this discussion.
- **Ken** - There is some tension between what NH DES is recommending and USGS is directed. We want to hear both sides. This committee needs to figure out the best direction for the state to go given the political realities.
- **Paul** – This is not a DES recommendation it is a “strawman” recommendation.
Background:
1st - Activities under the Water Resources Study Committee SB162, the charge of that legislative committee is to develop a comprehensive Water Management Plan for the entire state. Thanks to Senator Gregg the state received some seed money to move that along and it will include stream measurements.
2nd – The draft Water Monitoring Strategy came out first, the NH Water Management Plan which is being completed now will be presented soon.
All water management decisions should be data driven, we have the technology to monitor water quality and quantity and let that drive the public decision. The strategy we submit to EPA includes water quality and quantity, groundwater, and all other aspects of water resources. The “strawman” meshes with the activity that is going on in the legislature, the comprehensive water monitoring strategy and SB162 all fit together. Historically, USGS has always done our stream gaging. The only reason to rethink this is that we don't think it will happen in the future. We need to think about what we need

for stream gages, see if USGS can provide it. There are some that they cannot supply and that we cannot afford.

- **Mike** – USGS is the water science agency of the nation. First, our data is good data. We support water management which is data driven and data you can have confidence in. Second, it is important to have a single integrated system because it is cost effective. If every state had their own data base, it is silly for taxpayers of this country to put money in multiple data bases. Money comes to USGS to collect data, but it is incumbent on USGS to satisfy local, state and regional watershed needs. Our data is used for multiple purposes, for example the recreational community uses USGS data. We cannot predict that we will understand how this data will be used in the future. That we will not collect data for local needs is not correct. Stream gage installation should be done in consultation with other data users. The issue is converting that information into how much water is flowing by. Funding is important; this is the crux of the matter and should be the first issue.
- **Paul** – The details of data driven decision making, metadata, etc. are all dealt with in the Water Monitoring Strategy. Our strategy is consistent with the National Water Quality Monitoring Council. At the national level, costs are going up. The State had depended on hydro-power leases to fund these gages. With the PSNH buy-out of many of the leases, the income is just not there. Everything we are trying to manage relies on stream gages. Squeezing general fund money out of legislators is like squeezing a stone. We need to develop a strategic plan for the Legislature and everyone must say “fund it”.
- **Michele** – It is coming down to money and if there is continual erosion for stream gaging in NH, it is going to be a challenge for general funds. USGS drops more gages, a few each year, because federal government is falling short. It keeps happening and it is a moving target. If the NH Legislature see us going back year after year for this money because the federal government is derelict in their duties, we will not be able to keep doing that.
- **Ken** – If the state could come up with a match, USGS could continue?
- **Mike** – Yes, under the cooperative water program we can allow a 50/50 match. USGS is still supportive. By law there must be some federal interest. There has to be an interest or USGS can refuse to fund a gage because it doesn't meet the federal interest.
- **Brian** – The state of NH came to USGS and said we want to cut 7 gages out of the cooperative program. We don't have the money to operate these gages for general purposes they clearly need national interest. If USGS cuts 7 tailrace gages from the cooperative program we will have to cut a hydrologic technician person, and pull out of running 7 gages for operation of DES dams. No dollars have been eliminated from the USGS side to support gages in the state. Trends in other states have been going up. If the State comes back and says we made a mistake, it disappears overnight, but bringing it back will not be overnight.
- **Ken** – I am trying to understand, if the state came back with the money and understanding that there is a time lag, what kind of dollars are we looking at? Are we serving the broad public or just a licensing need for the hydro-owner.
- **Brian** – At any particular site we evaluate to see if it has a federal interest or a general broad interest.
- **Mike** - USGS has not lost interest but the state came to USGS and said that they had to drop gages due to funding. The other 7 we dropped because they didn't fit USGS interests. The state has been going in the direction of operating the gages at their own structures, the direction DES wanted to go.
- **Ken** – Are there any questions from committee members?

- **Michele** – Have other federal agencies or other state agencies been approached to share the funding?
- **Paul** – There is a need for strategic planning to determine what gages should be there. The RMAC should address this need to the Commissioner as to what gages we need and where for public decision-making. Once we get our arms around that then we can hand the plan to USGS to do it and we can go to web and get information.
- **Michele** – Can NHF&G pay for part?
- **Bill Ingham** – F&G has a fisheries habitat fund – you can make a request to get some of that money.
- **Michele** – Does DOT have an interest? Have other federal agencies been approached yet?
- **Paul** – We need a discussion of what gages should go. No gages essential to public management were eliminated. We have not done away with gages used to make water management decisions. I disagree that we ask for money first. We need to present a coordinated plan to folks that have money.
- **Brian** – You asked about other federal agencies, the issue is what is the mission of those agencies? Corp of Engineers - flood control structures operate a big chunk of the network in NH -18%. EPA pays us to do data collection for the duration of their projects. National Weather Service has consistently refused dollars for the program. FEMA is effective in funding new gages, they can supply dollars to install, but they do not have the authority to maintain and staff after installation.
- **Mike** – USGS has cooperative agreements with towns and non-profit organizations; there are all sorts of groups nationwide that we work with.
- **Ken** - Are we talking about a need to try and find money to maintain the gages we have lost, or are we talking about new ones and dropping some that are not needed?
- **Brian** – The network needs to be reworked periodically. The benefit of continuing a gage at one site may not be as high as moving it to another site. When Paul says the State doesn't have the match, the match has gone to someplace else.
- **Ken** - What kind of dollars are we looking for in NH?
- **Steve** – The state share is \$170,000 to \$190,000 (50% state share); then we had to sit down and see what gages were important to continue for the Dam Bureau. The Dam Bureau has limited dollars so managing the gages is not a good idea. Right now one-third are funded by DOT, some by pass-through organizations, and the rest is coming from the water conservation budget. Revenues in the maintenance dam fund are going down. There are a few gages that don't help us do what we do.
- **Mike** - In the last two years \$76,000 of federal fiscal match was left on the table. This year we have four gages on seacoast as part of brown water resources study. We have no plan to continue those gages at \$25,000 each or about \$100,000 over 3 years and *that is just half*.
- **Steve** - The assertion that Brian made that we could not do what USGS does, is accurate, we cannot do it at the same cost. I could operate for less than they do, but I would not get the quality of data they do.
- **Paul** - A QAPP is required to find out what data quality, precision, accuracy is needed before the monitoring activity. It is also true that it varies from project to project.
- **Jamie Robertson** - So \$200,000 is what we are talking about to get back to where we were?
- **Paul** – We have not identified management plans for the use of that data such as what decisions we need to make, the instream flow program is going forward. It is a good time to be thinking strategically.
- **Jamie** – Go from \$100,000 to a million dollars, we don't want to go back and build old gages for another million dollars because state cannot come up with the money. We

need a tourniquet on it now so it doesn't cost us twice as much to rebuild ones we have lost.

- **Paul** – Once a gage goes out it costs a lot to re-establish one. The technology costs have exploded, so it is easier and cheaper to maintain what we have.
- **Michele** - It is stopping the bleeding. It is a moving target as to what we are continuing to lose, so we must address these issues concurrently.
- **Jamie** – We need to go the legislature as a unified force, we need to obtain the objective information.
- **Ken** – First the band aid, then the question - is the state managing an instream flow program. First, we need a letter to the commissioner, a comprehensive plan that RMAC is working on and the framework of the bigger questions; and second, what position we can take relative to the band aid approach. DES is saying go to volunteers, but the universal voice that legislators need to hear is to come up with some dollars.
- **Paul** – The concept now which is in line with the strategy is more interaction with volunteers, if a watershed stewardship organization has identified a need for stream gaging data for their watershed, DES will help them develop the technical capability to get that data and to share that data with anybody else that wants it.
- **Deb Hinman** – At the state level, when we start talking instream flow the Legislature shuts down. However might it make more sense to get back to where we were? USGS doesn't have to lose staff and from that point branch out into the plan?
- **Brian** - We could divert money into studies if there is an opportunity to do so or put it in Vermont. If USGS money can't be used in NH then it will be used elsewhere such as Vermont.
- **Michele** – So let's discuss the nuts and bolts of the strategy, so who would want to participate in a work session?
- **Ken** – I agree with that, but on the funding issue the dollars must be attached to some proposed bill.
- **Mike** – USGS considers the people we work with as partners, we care that there is adequate data and want to help get the money.
- **Ken** – We need to break into this into two decisions: one is the recommendation for stream gaging – basically need to get whole process going with a task force.
- **Jamie** - Move ahead with the first one and work the second one into the first one with a task force. Recommend to the commissioner that we don't lose any more funds in this coming fiscal year for stream gaging.
- **Michele** - Nothing that we couldn't go forward with, it's just a strategy and not a final document. Committee adopts the final strategy.
- **Paul** - It needs more meat to come up with a strategy.
- **Michele** - Can't we say we initiated a strategy to get Commissioner's attention and that it is under revision?
- **Paul** – The committee would work over the ideas in the strategy because eventually, the governor will also take a look at this.
- **Deb** - It is an economic argument that will get attention.
- **Ken** – There are changing reasons why it should be adopted, developed and under review.
- **Jamie** - Adopt a strategy because we are losing federal money, and we need a strategy ASAP.
- **Ken** – Will work with Paul to change wording and then circulate for approval of all committee members via email and do it fast.

➤ ***Ken will work with Paul to change words to the strawman documents and they will email it out to the committee as soon as possible for their approval. Michele***

suggested wordsmithing two “Whereas” in an email and have people reply back to that. Mike and Carl offered to supply words and reply back to Ken and Paul.

- **Ken** – The second question before us – Is there any way through current legislation to add \$100,000 to a bill to keep our gages going. The real value of gages is broad general use. Find a bill that has a fiscal note attached to it. Argument to use with the Legislature is that we don’t want to lose the dollars. Are there other stakeholder groups that would be willing to work with the RMAC on this issue?
- **Carl Paulsen** - Legislators are concerned and know about the gages. The problem is getting any money before the next budget cycle. We should be looking for funding somehow.
- **Ken** - Commissioner Nolin should get committee together to get money for next budgeting cycle.
- **Carl** – Must wait till 2007 session. Cannot be done now, it has to wait until next budgeting cycle; organizations wanting gages will put up a strong argument.
- **Ken** – ***We must put this together and circulate it as fast as possible. We need to accelerate this for the next fiscal budget. Thanks to USGS for attending meeting.***
- **Mike** – ***Thank you, since we are big stake holders in this as well. It is the only way it will work.***

III. 1:15-1:30 pm: Committee Business – Jacquie Colburn

a. Rivers/Lakes Programs – Staffing Updates

By your next meeting, we should have the Assistant Planner on board.

Jacquie received an e-mail from Steve Couture. Steve hopes to be back home after the first of the year and back to work in February.

b. New River Nominations

The Ammonoosuc is a work in progress and may be ready for the RMAC to review in June 2006.

c. RMAC Membership (status)

i. NHACC – Deborah Hinman

Has been reappointed by G&C, so her new term expires 10/12/2007

ii. DRED – Johanna Lyons

Has been appointed for DRED

iii. F&G Commission – We are looking forward to getting a nomination for Walter Morse and will continue to work with NHF&G.

iv. Committee member terms that are expiring soon:

Ted – November, 2005

Ken and Michele – December, 2005

George – January, 2006

- **Michele** – We need a discussion relative to hydro interests. We have not seen George Lagassa in two years or more, and we need to go to HydroPower Association and ask for a new slate of names. Michele will contact George to determine his interest.
- **Jacquie** – An email regarding Financial Statement Forms were sent out via email back on 7/29/05. Jacquie asked RMAC members to sign the forms and turn them in.
- **Jacquie** – Handed out travel voucher forms to eligible RMAC members and requested that members sign them. They will be submitted so members can be reimbursed for their travel to/from the meeting.

IV. 2:15-2:45 pm: Updates on ISF Studies

Cold River Stream Gage Monitoring by Volunteers – Ted Walsh

Concept was based on Massachusetts RIFLS program. NHDES in partnership with the Cold River LAC developed a rating curve at the Drewsville Gorge station. This site was selected because a USGS station operated here until the 1970's. NHDES visited the site once a week throughout the summer and developed a rating curve. Rating curve developed showed a very good correlation between flow and stage. It also showed that at the flows measured the Cold River correlates very closely to the Saxton's River in Vermont. USGS gage at the Saxtons could be used as a surrogate to estimate flow on the Cold River. Success requires commitment from the volunteers to read the gage or invest in a datalogger. Although this is not a replacement for a USGS gage it does provide reliable data that otherwise would not exist.

- **Ken** – If one gives spot data, you could miss a lot of data.
- **Ted** - Saw a value at low flow, got participation of area folks that were not involved before. We would have to take gage out in winter and a rating curve would not cover high flows. Deborah and Mike (Mike was pushing for it before) were able to help. Even spot data has some value, interns could do four rivers a summer, once rating curve is established,
- **Ken** - Functionally didn't think it was useful.

Instream Flow Program 2003 – Wayne Ives

The 2003 assessment of annual water use versus stream flow report is on the web. These show monthly stream flow values transposed to locations on the Designated River as General Standard values. The 2004 report will be coming out in a while. [New registration and reporting rules are forthcoming.]

Issues pertaining to the Lamprey and Souhegan, contractual issues, should be done this year. IPUOCR list is going to committee on Oct. 7th to go over the list developed. Souhegan's biggest task is Task 5 [PISF assessment] is ongoing for the last several months, also working on the water management plans by talking to water users and dam owners. The Lamprey process was started in July. Task 1 [IPUOCR list] is done, Task 2 [Groundwater/surface water interactions] has begun NAI has collected 3 rounds of flow measurements tied in with the stream gage on the Lamprey. Task 9 [WMP sub-plans] information is being collected. ISF website has a lot of information.

- **Ken** – Critical question, need to report back in 2007 final reporting, comfortable with that?
- **Wayne** – yes.
- **Ken** – Timeline shows protected instream flow in August of 05.
- **Wayne** – Actually looking at completing instream flow this winter. Overall it is the contractors report; they can meet the final deadline, so I have not been asking for revised task schedules.
- **Ken** – One of the concerns is doing good science but not clear that they would come out with academic as opposed to useable in an administrative use. The ultimate value is something we can use. Need for other than DES to weigh in [on time schedule].
- **Wayne** - Not at this time. At this point, the biggest part of the project is underway. Task 5 includes a target fish community assessment, which is an important component of the flow assessments. I have put meeting with TRC on hold in order to complete the target fish community first. Meeting with the contractors Monday to finalize that process and then have meeting with Souhegan TRC that will include a discussion of the groundwater and surface water results [Task 2]. Target fish community is a component that we want to get right. On the Souhegan River– two different target fish communities, one for the top of the river and another for the bottom of the river. The team is UNH, Normandeau and UMass, just as on the Souhegan. Normandeau is the lead on the Lamprey instead

because of the savings when using federal funding. UNH has predetermined administration cost rules that Normandeau doesn't have.

Tom Quarles, representing the Public Water Access Advisory Board (PWAAB) and Mark Hemmerlein of the DOT – Environment Bureau, joined the meeting.

V. Surplus Land Reviews (SLR) – Disposition of State-Owned Properties

- **Ken** – Legislators took CORD out of the process but did not take our job out. The RMAC received input from Gretchen Hamel (DES Legal Unit) several years back regarding the committee's jurisdiction. Recently, CORD has asked the AG's office for further clarification.
- **Jacquie** – The legislation which recently took effect, removed CORD from the review of surplus lands that were purchased with federal, highway and turnpike funds. Jacquie distributed copies of the SLR process - a flowchart and accompanying narrative that Ben Frost put together as a result of the LMAC discussions.
- **Ben** walked the committee through the chart and explained the various steps, who is responsible and who has the authority to do what. If an agency determines that it has no need for the land, this starts the surplus land review process. The NH Housing Finance Authority can sell property and that raises the question regarding the statutory authority for the RMAC and LMAC. If turnpike or highway funds were used or if the land is part of the state hospital, then CORD is bypassed. But what is the role of the RMAC and LMAC in these situations? If property is a railroad lease then it will go to CORD. The statutes require that the RMAC and the LMAC look at these requests, but according to the statute, CORD only has to consider the RMAC position; however, historically, CORD has also sought and considered the LMAC position. The PWAAB has an advisory role regarding these surplus land reviews. CORD takes that all into account, then it goes to the Long Range Capital Planning Committee which determines the property value and then finally onto G&C. There are two legislative service requests (LSRs) that have been filed for the 2006 session by Representative Chandler. The titles of proposed bills suggest that there may be further action by legislators to remove CORD from the process entirely.
- **Jacquie** – Passed out a spreadsheet of SLRs that the LMPP and the RMPP have received and reviewed thus far in 2005. She explained that there is one SLR that the committee needs to act on. She also told the committee that at its most recent meeting, the LMAC also received this information. The LMAC asked her to do two things: First, compose a letter to DOT to initiate a formal process to review properties, since the law was passed taking CORD out of the review process. Second, send a letter to Governor's office expressing LMAC's concerns. RMAC participation in the letters would be appropriate.
- **Tom Quarles** – Asked the RMAC what is its interpretation of the statute.
- **Ken** - Our interpretation is that we have veto power, that we actually have an up or down vote. We felt that we did not need AG's clarification. Committee is clear as to what our rights are but Assistant Commission Walls sent it over for a decision anyway.
- **Tom Quarles** – Has your position ever been put to the test?
- **Ben** – Not the RMAC, but the LMAC recently said no to 3 SLRs. However, what that means has not been determined.
- **Tom Quarles** - The Public Water Advisory Board has started looking at land reviews and I expressed that the LMAC and RMAC had official roles so it doesn't make sense for three different entities to reinvent the work. Could the RMAC and LMAC communicate to the Public Water Advisory Board and then create a united decision? Taking state highway properties out of the mix was not there when I started talking about this with Jacquie. Hopefully, DOT will come before these two committees. I hope to establish some kind of procedure and protocol for the PWAAB to become involved, your position

would be the official and ours advisory with RMAC and LMAC having some comments on the details. Regarding the article in the NHLA newsletter, I am not in agreement with the reference to the role of PWAAB. For the PWAAB, we should be looking at all pieces of property to determine if it is suitable for public access.

- **Ken** – There is not a problem with Jacquie sharing the information and recommendations of the RMAC with you (PWAAB).
- **Tom Quarles** - Can DOT agree to work with the RMAC and the LMAC to send those properties to us? DOT do you want a checklist to do that. DOT is going to do their thing and provide that information to us.
- **Mark** – If LMAC and RMAC need to review these properties, then so be it and DOT will get these parcels to the committees. What is adjacent to or within 250 feet and does it have to be contiguous with the river?
- **Wes Stinson** – Expressed concern that the RMAC and LMAC may not receive notice from DOT regarding all properties which the committees have the statutory authority to review.
- **Jacquie** – In the interest of time she offered to compose a letter, on behalf of the RMAC and the LMAC that proposes a process to work with DOT. She will also meet with Mark, Ben and others to be sure that PWWAB is worked into the review and that we are not holding up things because of the scheduling of all our meetings.

SLR 05-015 Andover

Jacquie and the committee quickly reviewed the above referenced SLR. Jacquie explained the site location, its characteristics and what the town of Andover hopes to do with the lease. The public has used it as a ball field complex and now they want to put in a septic and parking area which will be 41 feet from railroad corridor

- **Michele** - If the town is installing a septic system and it fails but the state owns the property, is the state liable for the septic?
 - **Wes** - I am concerned about the cultural resources – this area has been disturbed by the town for years, taking out vegetation and putting in ball fields. We need to be sure that an archeological check is completed.
- **Michele – Motion to recommend disposal of the lease provided that there are no issues/concerned expressed by the Division of Historical Resources and the NH Natural Heritage Inventory Seconded by Jamie. Vote – all in favor.**
 - **Michele – Agenda under V b. moved to next agenda. Site specific rule process should be added to the next agenda.**
 - **Ken – We can do legislative updates at next meeting, however, HB 722 needs a few minutes; River Access will postpone to next time.**
- **Jamie Robertson** - HB 722, the committee met this morning.
 - **Ken** - We took a vote a year ago, but if the legislation has changed then we need to take another vote.
 - **Deb** - As of 11:30 am today, the E&A study committee met and developed a draft for the full committee. Since they did not have a quorum they are meeting again next Tuesday. They were making changes to the draft as we left the room.
 - **Ken** - That is a challenge and it is still in draft form. Jamie represents the RMAC and two other RMAC members sit on the study committee, so if something comes out of the next meeting, and you three are in agreement, then send it to Jacquie or me and we can do an email vote –but if it turns out there is a disconnect between all of those involved, we need to bring before RMAC at its next meeting.

- **Rivers Conference Announcement**

It is not going to happen in November, maybe early March. Nothing more substantive except it is in progress.

- **Next Meeting Date/Adjourn:**
- ***November 21st, 9:30am -12:30 pm.***
- **Motion to Adjourn**
- ***Motion to adjourn meeting made by Deb Hinman and seconded by Michele L. Tremblay, unanimous vote to adjourn meeting.***
- **Adjourned at 4:35 p.m.**